

REMARKS

Specification Amendments

The paragraph on page 1, starting on page 15 and continuing to line 18 has been amended.

5 The statement regarding federally sponsored research or development has been amended.

Claim Status

Claims 1, 5-10, and 13-22 are canceled. Claims 2-4, 11, and 12 have been amended.

Claims 23-39 are new.

10

Support for the new claims can be found throughout the Application as originally filed. In particular, for new claims 23 and 29, support for the interactive workspace can be found be found at least in Table 2, support for the post and retrieve functions can be found at least in Table 7, support for matching can be found at least from page 41, line 3 to page 15 42, line 5, and support for unordered named fields can be found at least on page 39, line 24.

15

Support for new claims 24 and 30 can be found at least on page 35, lines 4-8. Support for new claims 25-26 and 31-32 can be found at least on page 35, lines 10-28. Support for 20 new claims 27 and 38 can be found at least on page 19, lines 9-10. Support for new claims 28 and 39 can be found at least on page 22, lines 27-29. All tables, pages, and line numbers refer to the Application as originally filed. Support for new claims 33-37 can be found at least in the original claims. No new matter has been added.

25

Regarding Claim Objections

Claims 13 and 16-22 were objected to because of informalities.

In reply, claims 13 and 16-22 have been canceled.

5

Regarding 35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection

Claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being nonstatutory.

In reply, independent claim 1 has been canceled. Claims 2-4 and 11-12 have been
10 amended to depend from new claim 23. Claims 5-10 and 13-22 have been canceled. New
independent claim 23 and new independent claim 29 are directed to a computer system
and a method, respectively, for exchanging events in an interactive workspace.
Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections are rendered moot.

15 ***Regarding 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection***

Claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Ahmed et al.
(US 6,647,432) in view of Bent et al. (US 6,901,441).

In reply, it is noted that independent claim 1 has been canceled. New independent claims
20 23 and 29 are added. Claims 2-4 and 11-12 have been amended and depend from new
claim 23. New claims 24-28 ultimately depend from new independent claim 23. And new
claims 30-39 ultimately depend from new independent claim 29.

It is important to note that new claims 23 and 29 teach a computer system and a method, respectively, for exchanging events between heterogeneous software applications run by heterogeneous machines, where the events are exchanged between multiple clients through a server. The cited text of Ahmed does not teach heterogeneous software applications run by heterogeneous machines.

Furthermore, the cited text of Ahmed teaches away from exchanging events between two clients through a server by teaching that an “event is transmitted directly from the second application to the first application without routing that event information through the server” (abstract).

New claims 23 and 29 also teach a set of *unordered* named fields. The cited text of Ahmed and the cited text of Bent do not teach a set of unordered named fields. In contrast, the cited text of Bent teaches an *ordered* collection of fields. Accordingly, for at least these reasons new claim 23 and claims 2-4, 11-12, and 24-28, ultimately depending from claim 23, should be allowed. Similarly, independent claim 29 and dependent claims 30-39 should be allowed.

It is also noted that neither the cited text of Ahmed nor the cited text of Bent teaches expiration fields of new claims 24 and 30 or query registration using query event templates of new claims 25 and 31. In addition, the cited text of Ahmed and the cited text of Bent do not teach using source *and* target fields as described in amended claims 2 and 3 and new claims 33 and 34. Similarly, neither the cited text of Ahmed nor the cited text of Bent teaches a post value *and* a template value for each field as described in amended

claim 4 and new claim 35. For at least these reasons, claims 2-4, 24-25, 30-31, and 33-35 should be allowed.

CONCLUSION

The Applicant hereby submits a bona fide attempt to address the objection and rejections in the Office Action and argues why the present claims are different from the art of record.

- 5 The Examiner is sincerely invited to telephone the undersigned at 650-424-0100 for clarification or any suggested actions such as an Examiner's Amendment to accelerate prosecution and forward the present application to allowance. Allowance of the claims now in the application is kindly requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Trieu T. Mai /

Trieu T. Mai
Reg. No. 61,354
Lumen IPS
2345 Yale Street, Second Floor
Palo Alto, CA 94306
650-424-0100 (phone)